



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/830,114	04/23/2004	Margaret S. Brenner	J47004.Y00267 JPC-024	9022
70813	7590	05/18/2009		
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20001			EXAMINER CARTER, CANDICE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3629	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/18/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

AAAlpha-Kpetewama@goodwinprocter.com  
patentdc@goodwinprocter.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/830,114	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BRENNER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CANDICE D. CARTER	<b>Art Unit</b> 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The Following is a Final Office Action in response to communications received on March 31, 2009. No claims have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-33 are pending and have been addressed below.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. **Claims 1-15 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

Claims 1-15 and 33 are directed towards a computer implemented method for management and delivery of content and rules, comprising, managing data, packaging data, delivering data, integrating data, and distributing data.

Examiner contends that a process must be (1) tied a particular machine or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing.

An applicant may show that a process claim satisfies 35 U.S.C. § 101 either by showing that his claim is tied to a particular machine, or by showing that his claim transforms an article. See Benson, 409 U.S. at 70. Certain considerations are applicable to analysis under either branch. First, the use of a specific machine or transformation of an article must impose meaningful limits on the claim's scope to impart patent eligibility. See Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72. Second, the involvement of the

machine or transformation in the claimed process must not merely be insignificant extra-solution activity. See *Flook*, 437 U.S. at 590. *In re Bilski*.

Examiner would like to note that in machine involvement considered to be insignificant extra-solution activity includes the storing, displaying, sending, receiving, and gathering of data.

In the instant case, the recitation of a computer in the preamble of the claims is merely insignificant extra-solution activity and, thus, does not qualify as a statutory the invention as a process. In addition, machines used for storage are also considered to be involvement that is insignificant extra-solution activity.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-6, 9-21, and 29-32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over George et al. (2002/0095481, hereinafter George) in view of LeMole et al. (6,009,410, hereinafter LeMole) and further in view of Quatse et al. (2005/0010472, hereinafter Quatse).**

As per claim 16, George discloses "A system for management and delivery of content and rules, the system comprising:

at least one first database entity that manages a plurality of data” (Fig. 1 discloses a customer database managing customer information);

“at least one second database entity that manages a plurality of content, wherein the plurality of content is associated with the plurality of data based on a plurality of rules” (Fig. 1 discloses a content database and ¶ 8 discloses that the content database contains product data sets that are associated with the customers and ¶ 23 discloses associating the product data sets with the customer data using a set of business rules);

“a processor module” (Fig. 1 discloses an email content merge program that serves as a processor module);

“a delivery module” (Fig. 1 discloses an email delivery server);

“and one or more presentation channels” (Fig. 1 discloses an email delivery server that serves as a presentation channel, where the electronic communication is used as a presentation channel);

“where the processor module packages the plurality of rules with the plurality of content in a carrier that is independent from the one or more presentation channels, wherein at least part of the plurality of content is integrated with at least part of the plurality of data” (¶ 19 discloses the email content merge program selecting a product data set as a function of the information contained in the customer database and business rules as disclosed in ¶ 23 so that a message can be constructed, where it is inherent that a carrier is used to package and transport information);

“the delivery module delivers the plurality of data and the carrier to the one or more presentation channels” (¶ 19 discloses constructing and sending a communications message such as an email);

“and the one or more presentation channels integrate the plurality of data with the plurality of content based on the plurality of rules, and distribute the integrated data and content” (¶ 19 discloses constructing and sending a communications message such as an email and ¶ 23 discloses associating the product data sets with the customer data using a set of business rules).

George, however, fails to explicitly disclose “the plurality of rules controlling a logical combination and physical layout of the plurality of data and plurality of content”; “logically integrate the data and content and control the physical layout of the integrated data”; and “multiple presentation channels”.

LeMole discloses a method and system for presenting customized advertising to a user on the World Wide Web having a plurality of rules controlling a logical combination and physical layout of the plurality of data and logically integrating the data and content and controlling the physical layout of the integrated data and content (col. 7, line 36-55 discloses providing to the user information elements that are composited, arranged and presented specifically for the user based on some predetermined information, where the predetermined information are rules, where compositing is integrating, and where arranging is arranging the physical layout of the content).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system for customizing electronic

communications of George to include the integration of data and content and the controlling of the physical layout of the data and content as taught by LeMole since such would increase the probably of presenting information that is of particular interest to the particular user.

Quatse discloses high-precision customer-based targeting having multiple presentation channels (§ 36 discloses multiple presentations such as email, cellular, telephones, PDAs, Internet, direct mail, voice phone, and others).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system for customizing electronic communication of George to include the multiple presentations as taught by Quatse in order to reduce the negative effects of distributing offers on paper by providing a practical and efficient method for multi-channel distribution (see Quatse § 17).

Claims 1, 31, and 32 recite equivalent limitations to claim 16 and are, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 2, George discloses “the plurality of data is associated with a plurality of products and a plurality of clients” (§ 19 discloses a customer profile/behavioral data stored in a database that is associated with product data sets from a content database).

Claim 17 recites equivalent limitations to claim 2 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 3, George discloses “the plurality of data and the plurality of content is associated with financial products” (¶ 19 discloses the content database managing product data sets).

Examiner considers financial products to be nonfunctional descriptive material as recited. The type of product that the content is associated with does not change the function of the claimed invention. Examiner contends that the content database of George is fully capable of managing any type of product data.

Claim 18 recites equivalent limitations to claim 3 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 4, the George, LeMole and Quatse combination discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “the carrier comprises a plurality of style tags, wherein the plurality of style tags are associated with the plurality of content based on a plurality of rules”.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system for customizing electronic communications of George to include style tags associated with the plurality of content based on a plurality of rules because “they are known to those skilled in the art as features present in various types of files such as HTML files in order to define style rules within a documents HTML tag” through Applicant's admission provided on pgs. 15-16 of arguments.

Claim 19 recites equivalent limitations to claim 4 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.



As per claim 5, George discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the plurality of content comprises a graphic element".

LeMole discloses a method and system for presenting customized advertising to a user on the World Wide Web presenting graphic element content (abstract discloses 3D images, animation, and video).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system of customizing electronic communications of George to include the graphic element content as taught by LeMole in order to sufficiently present the content to the user in a format that is easily understood.

Claim 20 recites equivalent limitations to claim 5 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 6, George discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the plurality of content is stored in at least one media-independent format".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for customizing electronic communications of George to include the content stored in media-independent format because it is old and well known to store information in different formats that may be compatible with different systems.

Claim 21 recites equivalent limitations to claim 6 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 9, George discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “the integration of plurality of data with the plurality of content is further based on the specific needs of the one or more presentation channels”.

Quatse discloses high-precision customer-based targeting integrating the data based on the specific needs of the one or more presentation channels (§ 36 discloses promotional offers are presented by distributing offers through the channels in formats particular to the channel).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for customizing electronic communications of George to include the integration of data based on the needs of the presentation channel as taught by Quatse in order to facilitate the use of the different presentation channels.

Claim 24 recites equivalent limitations to claim 9 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 10, George discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “sharing the plurality of data and the plurality of content among a plurality of business lines”.

Quatse discloses high-precision customer-based targeting sharing the plurality of data and the plurality of content among the plurality of business lines (§ 48 discloses segmenting customers into market segments, where customer and product data are shared among market segments and where examiner construes market segments to be business lines).

As per claim 11, George discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “editing the plurality of content and the plurality of business rules via a user interface”.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for customizing electronic communications of George to include the editing of content and business rules via a user interface because it is old and well known to edit information that is used for business operations and to edit information using an interface such as a keyboard in order to ensure that the information is accurate and up to date.

Claim 26 recites equivalent limitations to claim 11 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 12, George discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “comprising previewing at least one combination of the plurality of data and the plurality of content for legal compliance”.

Quatse discloses laws penalizing a telemarketer who calls a telephone that is registered on a “do not call” list (§ 12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for customizing electronic communications of George to include the penalty for calling those telephone numbers that are on the “do not call list” in order to deter telemarketing companies from violating the list.

The George, LeMole, and Quatse combination fails to explicitly disclose “previewing the plurality of data and content for legal compliance”.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for customizing electronic communications of the George, LeMole, and Quatse combination to include previewing content for legal compliance because it is old and well known to monitor business operations to ensure that all practices comply with the law.

Claim 27 recites equivalent limitations to claim 12 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 13, the George, LeMole, and Quatse combination discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “auditing the integrated data and content prior to the step of distributing”.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for customizing electronic communications of the George, LeMole, and Quatse combination to include auditing the data before distributing the content because it is old and well known to review documents or content in order to make sure that they are in compliance with company policy.

Claim 28 recites equivalent limitations to claim 13 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 14, George discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “automatically generating at least one layout file for distribution”.

Quatse discloses high-precision customer-based targeting generating at least one layout file for distribution (§ 63 discloses offer distribution lists).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for customizing electronic communications of George to include the distribution list as taught by Quatse in order to distribute the promotional offers to customers.

Claim 29 recites equivalent limitations to claim 14 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 15, George discloses “the one or more presentation channels comprises an electronic communication” (Fig. 1 and § 19 discloses an email message)

Claim 30 recites equivalent limitations to claim 15 and is, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

**6. Claims 7, 8, 22, 23, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over George in view of LeMole in view of Quatse and further in view of Todd et al. (20030061057, hereinafter Todd).**

As per claims 7 and 8, the George, LeMole, and Quatse combination discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “the plurality of content is packaged based on an extensible markup language” and “the plurality of rules are packages based on an XSL transformations language”.

Todd discloses a storage service registration application using XML and XSL (§ 82 discloses XSL as a rule based language for transforming XML).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system for customizing electronic communications of the George, LeMole, and Quatse combination to include the XML and XSL as taught by Todd since such would facilitate transforming the content into a composite presentation of data.

Claims 22 and 23 recite equivalent limitations to claims 7 and 8 and are rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 33 George discloses “A method for management and delivery of content and rules, the method comprising:

managing, for an organization, a plurality of data and a plurality of content in separate database entities, wherein the plurality of data are associated with a plurality of products and a plurality of clients, and the plurality of content is associated with the plurality of data based on a plurality of rules” (§ 8 discloses a customer database and a content database and § 23 discloses associating content and customer data based on business rules);

“packaging the plurality of rules with the plurality of content in a carrier that is independent from one or more presentation channels, wherein at least part of the plurality of content is integrated with at least part of the plurality of data” (§ 19 discloses an email content merge program, merging the content and customer data together, where it is inherent that the information is transported using a carrier),

“delivering the plurality of data and the carrier to the one or more presentation channels, wherein the one or more presentation channels comprise at least one of an Internet website, a printed communication, an electronic communication, a printed advertisement, a broadcast advertisement, a telemarketing script, an interactive voice response unit message, an automatic teller machine (ATM) message, and a display-board message” (§ 19 discloses constructing and sending a communications message such as an email);

“integrating, at the one or more presentation channels, the plurality of data with the plurality of content based on the plurality of rules and distributing the integrated data and content through the one or more presentation channels” (§ 19 discloses an email content merge program, merging the content and customer data together and emailing the content to the customer).

George, however, fails to explicitly disclose “the plurality of content is stored in at least one media-independent format and comprises at least one of a discrete text element, a compiled text element and a graphic element, the plurality of content is packaged based on an extensible markup language (XML), and the plurality of rules are packaged based on an XSL transformations (XSLT) language; and the content is packaged based on the specific needs of the one or more presentation channels”;

LeMole discloses a method and system for presenting customized advertising to a user on the World Wide Web presenting graphic element content (abstract discloses 3D images, animation, and video).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system of customizing electronic communications of George to include the graphic element content as taught by LeMole in order to sufficiently present the content to the user in a format that is easily understood.

The George and LeMole combination fails to explicitly disclose that the content is packaged based on the specific needs of multiple presentation channels.

Quatse discloses high-precision customer-based targeting integrating the data based on the specific needs of the one or more presentation channels (¶ 36 discloses promotional offers are presented by distributing offers through the multiple channels in formats particular to the channel).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system for customizing electronic communication of George to include the multiple presentations as taught by Quatse in order to reduce the negative effects of distributing offers on paper by providing a practical and efficient method for multi-channel distribution (see Quatse ¶ 17).

The George, LeMole, and Quatse combination discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “the plurality of content is packages based on an extensible markup language” and “the plurality of rules are packages based on an XSL transformations language.

Todd discloses a storage service registration application using XML and XSL (¶ 82 discloses XSL as a rule based language for transforming XML).



Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system for customizing electronic communications of the George, LeMole, and Quatse combination to include the XML and XSL as taught by Todd since such would facilitate transforming the content into a composite presentation of data.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed March 31, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's arguments with regard to the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections, **Examiner respectfully disagrees.** Claims 1 and 33, as currently recited, do not have to be carried out by one or more computers. For example, managing data in database entities could be managing files in a file cabinet, where the file cabinet is database as a database is defined as simply "an organized body of related information" (definition available at: [wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn](http://wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn)); packaging the plurality of rules with a plurality of content could be placing handwritten rules and content into an envelope to be transported; delivering the plurality of data and the carrier could be performed simply by walking or driving the envelope to an outgoing mailbox or some other destination; integrating the data could be combining and assembling the data by hand according to rules pertaining to who is supposed to receive what content; and distributing the data through the presentation channel could be a mailman delivering the data.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., the packaging of rules with content into a channel-independent carrier and the delivery of data and the carrier to multiple presentation channels both occur prior to the eventual communications with customers) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's arguments pertaining to the comparison of what is being packaged/delivered in the claimed invention versus in George's disclosure, **Examiner respectfully disagrees.** ¶ 23 of George discloses packaging a plurality of rules with the plurality of content (via at least one product or service data set and a set of business rules is selected from the content database). A communications message by itself as disclosed in ¶ 19 is independent of any specific presentation channel. For example, a communications message could be a message written on a piece of paper or stored in some word processing program that has yet to be formatted for and/or sent through any presentation channel. In addition, examiner asserts that the communication message itself is the carrier, where the message contains the data.

In response to applicant's arguments that George does not disclose multiple presentation channels and against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's arguments against citing the same paragraph from George for disclosing the processor module, delivery module, and presentation channels, with the respective packaging, delivering and integrating functions as recited in claim 16, **Examiner respectfully disagrees.** Examiner asserts that the delivery module and processor modules and presentation channels are not recited in the claim language as being different elements. Nowhere in the claim language does the Applicant suggest that the functions of these modules cannot be performed by the same element. Examiner contends that it is possible for one software module to act as a delivery module, processor module, and a presentation channel.

Furthermore, Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to separate the functions of the single element into separate elements performing the delivery, processing, and presentation since it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. *Nerwin v. Erlichman*, 168 USPQ 177, 179.

In response to Applicant's arguments that none of the cited references is related to content management for multiple channels, **Examiner respectfully disagrees.** Examiner asserts that Quatse discloses presenting content to customers using multiple presentation channels including email, cell phones, PDAs, Internet, direct mail, voice phone, and others as taught in ¶ 36. A person of ordinary skill in the pertinent art would be motivated to combine the cited references with the multiple distribution channels of Quatse in order to reduce the negative effects of distributing offers on paper by

providing a practical and efficient method for multi-channel distribution (see Quatse ¶ 17).

In response to arguments in reference to claims 2-15, and 17-30, all rejections made towards the dependent claims are maintained due to a lack of reply by the applicant in regards to distinctly and specifically pointing out the supposed errors in the examiner's prior office action (37 CFR 1.111). The Examiner asserts that the applicant only argues that the dependent claims should be allowable because the independent claims are unobvious and patentable over the prior art.

### ***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CANDICE D. CARTER whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 3629

(571) 270-5105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday  
7:30am- 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. D. C./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/JOHN G WEISS/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629